REMARKS

In the Office Action dated December 7,2005, Claims 1, 3-17, 23 and 27-30 are pending. Claims 8, 23 and 27 are rejected. Claims 9-10 and 28-29 are objected to for depending upon rejected base claims but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 1, 3-7, 11-17 and 30 are allowed.

This Response addresses each of the Examiner's objections and rejections.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration of all pending claims is therefore respectfully requested.

In the Action, the Examiner indicates that Applicants have not filed a certified copy of the priority document, CA 2221819, as required by 35 U.S.C. §119(b). Applicants will provide a certified copy of the priority document as soon as such copy is received.

The Examiner has objected to claim 27.

Applicants have canceled claim 27 by the foregoing amendment. Withdrawal of the objection is therefore respectfully requested.

The Examiner has also objected to claim 29 for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. The Examiner has suggested canceling claim 29, amending claim 29 in proper dependent form, or rewriting claim 29 as an independent claim. The Examiner has further indicated that claim 29, if rewritten in independent form, would be allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 29 has been amended to depend from allowed claim 1, rather than claim 9. As amended, claim 29 further defines the insect promoter recited in claim 1. Withdrawal of the objection to claim 29 is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 8 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8 and 27 have been canceled in an effort to favorably advance prosecution. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8 and 27 is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner contends that it is unclear as to whether the "heterologous insect ion transport peptide hormone", recited in the claim, is encoded by a sequence in the shuttle vector or not.

Applicants have amended claim 23 to clarify that the heterologous insect ion transport peptide hormone is encoded by a sequence in the shuttle vector and is expressed in the recombinant cells. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 9-10 and 28-29 are objected to for depending upon rejected base claims but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants have amended these claims to delete the reference to rejected base claims, and to depend directly or indirectly from allowed claim 1. Withdrawal of the objection to these claims is therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is firmly believed that the subject application is in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Xiaochun Zhu

Registration No. 56,311

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P. C. 400 Garden City Plaza-Ste 300 Garden City, New York 11530 (516) 742-4343 XZ:ab